OBSERVATION REPORT # 41

Numerous metrics in the New Jersey June, July, August and September 2000 Carrier-to-Carrier Reports deviate from the New Jersey Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines (May 2000), lacking required data and other elements.

Issue

The New Jersey Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines (May 2000) outlines the reporting requirements of the Carrier-to Carrier (C2C) Report to be generated by Verizon (VZN) on a monthly basis. KPMG Consulting has found discrepancies between these Guidelines and the June, July, August and September 2000 Carrier-to-Carrier Reports.

The tables below list the metrics that were missing from the Carrier-to-Carrier reports (Table 1), data elements that were missing from the Carrier-to-Carrier reports (Table 2), metric descriptions on Carrier-to-Carrier reports which did not fully match the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines (Table 3), metric exclusions in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that are inconsistent with the metric definitions in those Guidelines (Table 4), metrics that were reported as Under Development (UD) when they should have been available (Table 5), incorrect metric standards on Carrier-to-Carrier reports (Table 6), metric calculations in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that are inconsistent with the metric definitions in those Guidelines(Table 7), and metric descriptions in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that are inconsistent with metric titles in those Guidelines (Table 8).

Where relevant, the documents used to assess these observations included: the May 2000 New Jersey Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines, the June, July, August and September 2000 New Jersey Carrier-to-Carrier Reports and Docket Nos. TX98010010 and TX95120631 (including Appendix A and B).

Table 1: Metrics missing from the June, July, August and September 2000 Carrier-to-Carrier Reports

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|----------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| PR | PR-4-01 | UNE - | % Missed Appointment - Total | This metric did not appear on the |
| | | Specials | | June, July, August or September |
| | | | | Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. Only EEL |
| | | | | and IOF metrics were reported. |
| | PR-4-02 | UNE - | Average Delay Days - Total | This metric did not appear on the |
| | | Specials | | June, July, August or September |
| | | | | Carrier-to-Carrier Reports. Only EEL |
| | | | | and IOF metrics were reported. |

Table 2: Data elements missing from the June, July, August and September 2000 Carrier-to-Carrier Reports

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|---|---|---|
| | | POTS | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/DD 2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial #) (Residential. POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch) | The NJ Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines require disaggregation of "POTS-Residential 2 nd Line-Dispatch". The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports did not report "POTS-Residential 2 nd line". |
| | PR-3-10 | Retail - POTS | % Completed w/in 6 Days (1-5 Lines) (Residential POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch) | The NJ Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines require disaggregation of "Residential POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch". The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports did not report "POTS- Residential 2 nd line". |
| | PR-4-14 | Retail – POTS | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL (w/DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial #) (Residential. POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch | The NJ Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines require disaggregation of "Residential POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch". The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports did not report "POTS- Residential 2 nd line". |
| | PR-8-01 | UNE - Specials | % Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days | UNE Specials were missing from June 2000 C2C report, but were reported on the July, August and September 2000 C2C reports. |
| | PR-8-02 | UNE – Specials | % Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days | UNE Specials were missing from June 2000 C2C report, but were reported on the July, August and September 2000 C2C reports. |
| PO | | Mgmt. Notices/ | % Change Management Notices and Change Management Confirmations Sent On-Time – Total (Change Management Notices and Confirmations Combined; Types 1-5 Combined) | Change management confirmation data was not reported on the June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports. |
| | | Change Mgmt. Notices/ Confirm. | Change Management Notices and Change Management Confirmations – Delay 1 to 7 days. | Change management confirmation data was not reported on the June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports. |
| | | Change Mgmt. Notices/ Confirm. | Change Management Notices and Change Management Confirmations – Delay 8 or more days. | Change management confirmation data was not reported on the June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports. |

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and is subject to change without notice.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|----------|---------------|---|--|
| NP | NP-1-02 | Retail – | % Final Trunk Groups Exceeding | The space for reporting the data in |
| | | BA | Blocking Standard – (No Exceptions)- | the September 2000 C2C report was |
| | | Common | Common and Dedicated | blank. |
| | | Final | | |
| | | Trunks | | |
| | | Trunks – | | |
| | | BA to CLEC | | |
| | NP-5-01 | | % of Network Outage Notices sent within | Although the standard is Parity |
| | 111-3-01 | Ketan | 30 minutes | w/Retail, on the June, July, August |
| | | | | and September 2000 C2C reports |
| | | | | there was no Retail data reported. |
| | NP-6-01 | Retail | % of NXX Updates Installed by the | According to the NJ C2C Guidelines, |
| | | | LERG Effective Date | this metric is to be measured and |
| | | | | reported on a calendar quarterly |
| | | | | basis. Although the standard is Parity |
| | | | | w/Retail, there was no Retail data |
| | | | | reported on the June and September |
| | | | | 2000 C2C reports. |

Table 3: Metric descriptions on the Carrier-to-Carrier reports that did not fully match the descriptions in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR | PR-2-13 | UNE- 2 Wire xDSL | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/DD 2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial #) (Residential. POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the 800# from the description. |
| | PR-2-14 | UNE – 2 Wire xDSL | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/DD 2 Test Results, w/800#, w/ or w/o serial #) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the 800# and the serial# from the description. |
| | PR-2-15 | UNE – 2 Wire xDSL | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial #) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the 800# from the description. |
| | PR-2-16 | UNE – 2 Wire xDSL | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/ or w/o serial #) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the serial# from the description. |
| | PR-2-17 | UNE – 2 Wire xDSL | Average Interval Completed – 2 Wire xDSL (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/o 800#, w/o serial #) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the serial# from the description. |
| | PR-4-14 | UNE – 2 Wire xDSL | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL (w/DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial #) (Residential. POTS-2 nd Line-Dispatch) | The description on the C2C reports did not fully match the description in the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, August and September 2000 C2C reports omitted the 800# from the description. |

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | PR-4-15 | UNE – | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL | The description on the C2C reports |
| | | 2 Wire | (w/DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/ or w/o | did not fully match the description in |
| | | xDSL | serial #) | the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, |
| | | | | August and September 2000 C2C |
| | | | | reports omitted the 800# and the |
| | | | | serial# from the description. |
| | PR-4-16 | UNE – | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL | The description on the C2C reports |
| | | 2 Wire | (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/serial | did not fully match the description in |
| | | xDSL | #) | the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, |
| | | | | August and September 2000 C2C |
| | | | | reports omitted the 800# from the |
| | | | | description. |
| | PR-4-17 | UNE – | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL | The description on the C2C reports |
| | | 2 Wire | (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/800#, w/ or | did not fully match the description in |
| | | xDSL | w/o serial #) | the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, |
| | | | | August and September 2000 C2C |
| | | | | reports omitted the serial# from the |
| | | | | description. |
| | PR-4-18 | | % Completed On Time – 2 Wire xDSL | The description on the C2C reports |
| | | 2 Wire | (w/o DD-2 Test Results, w/o 800#, w/o | did not fully match the description in |
| | | xDSL | serial #) | the C2C Guidelines. The June, July, |
| | | | | August and September 2000 C2C |
| | | | | reports omitted the serial# from the |
| | | | | description. |

Table 4: Metric exclusions in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that were inconsistent with the metric definitions in those Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines.

| Domain | Metric | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|--------|--------------------|--|
| PR | PR-7 | Jeopardy Reports | The wording in the metric exclusion |
| | | | is unclear. Interpreted literally, it is |
| | | | inconsistent with the metric |
| | | | definition. The exclusion should read |
| | | | "Orders that are not complete nor |
| | | | canceled." |

Table 5: Metrics that were reported as Under Development (UD) in the Carrier-to-Carrier Reports, but should have been available as of August 2000, according to Appendix B of Docket Nos. TX98010010 and TX95120631.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|---------|---------------------------------------|--|
| PO | PO-8-01 | OSS | % On Time- Manual Loop Qualification | This metric was listed as TBD on the August 2000 C2C report. It was supposed to have been implemented by August 1, 2000 according to Attachment B of NJ PUC Order Dockets # TX95120631 and TX98010010. It was reported UD on the September 2000 C2C report. |
| | PO-8-02 | OSS | % On Time- Engineering Record Request | This metric was listed as TBD on the August 2000 C2C report. It was supposed to have been implemented by August 1, 2000 according to Attachment B of NJ PUC Order Dockets # TX95120631 and TX98010010. It was reported UD on the September 2000 C2C report. |

Table 6: Incorrect Standards on the June, July, August and September 2000 Carrier-to-Carrier Reports.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|--------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| OR | | RESALE - POTS UNE – Loop, Platform | % On Time LSRC < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 24 hours". August, September 2000 C2C reports showed "95% on time within 48 hours". |
| | | RESALE /UNE- 2 Wire Digital, 2 Wire xDSL | % On Time LSRC < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 72 hours". September 2000 C2C report showed "95% on time within 96 hours". |

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | RESALE /UNE – Specials Non- DSO, | % On Time LSRC < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 48 hours". August, September 2000 C2C reports showed "95% on time within 72 hours". |
| | OR-1-10 | DS1, DS3 RESALE | % On Time LSRC >/= 6 Lines – Fax | Standard should be "95% on time |
| | | – POTS, 2 Wire Digital, 2 Wire xDSL, Specials | | within 72 hours". August, September 2000 C2C reports showed "95% on time within 96 hours". |
| | | UNE - Loop, Platform, 2 Wire Digital, 2 Wire xDSL, Specials | | |
| | OR-2-08 | | % On Time LSR Reject < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 24 hours". August, September 2000 C2C reports showed "95% on time within 48 hours". |
| | | | % On Time LSR Reject < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 72 hours". September 2000 C2C report showed "95% on time within 96 hours". |
| | | | % On Time LSR Reject < 6 Lines - Fax | Standard should be "95% on time within 48 hours". August, September 2000 C2C reports showed "95% on time within 72 hours". |

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and is subject to change without notice. 7

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | OR-2-10 | RESALE | % On Time LSR Reject >/= 6 Lines – Fax | Standard should be "95% on time |
| | | - POTS, | | within 72 hours". August, |
| | | 2 Wire | | September 2000 C2C reports |
| | | Digital, 2 | | showed "95% on time within 96 |
| | | Wire | | hours". |
| | | xDSL, | | |
| | | Specials | | |
| | | | | |
| | | UNE - | | |
| | | Loop, | | |
| | | Platform, | | |
| | | 2 Wire | | |
| | | Digital, 2 | | |
| | | Wire | | |
| | | xDSL, | | |
| | | Specials | | |

Table 7: Metric calculations in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that are inconsistent with the metric definitions in those Guidelines.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| PO | PO-4-01 | Change | % Change Management Notices and Change | The metric description in the C2C |
| | | Mgmt. | Management Confirmations Sent On-Time – | Guidelines implies that values for |
| | | Notices/ | Total (Change Management Notices and | change management notices and |
| | | Confirm. | Confirmations Combined; Types 1-5 | change management confirmations |
| | | | Combined) | are to be reported separately. |
| | | | | However, the way the formula for |
| | | | | the calculation is written suggests |
| | | | | that they be combined. |
| | PO-4-02 | Change | Change Management Notices and Change | The metric description in the C2C |
| | | Mgmt. | Management Confirmations – Delay 1 to 7 | Guidelines implies that values for |
| | | Notices/ | days. | change management notices and |
| | | Confirm. | | change management confirmations |
| | | | | are to be reported separately. |
| | | | | However, the way the formula for |
| | | | | the calculation is written suggests |
| | | | | that they be combined. |

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | PO-4-03 | Change | Change Management Notices and Change | The metric description in the C2C |
| | | Mgmt. | Management Confirmations – Delay 8 or | Guidelines implies that values for |
| | | Notices/ | more days. | change management notices and |
| | | Confirm. | | change management confirmations |
| | | | | are to be reported separately. |
| | | | | However, the way the formula for |
| | | | | the calculation is written suggests |
| | | | | that they be combined. |

Table 8: Metric descriptions in the Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines that are inconsistent with metric titles in those Guidelines.

| Domain | Metric | Product | Metric Description | Issue |
|--------|---------|---------|---|---------------------------------------|
| BI | BI-3-01 | CRIS | % Billing Adjustments – Including Charges | The metric definition describes a |
| | | | Adjusted Due to Billing Errors Resulting | billing <i>error</i> measurement, not |
| | | | from Order Activity Post Completion | billing accuracy. |
| | | | Discrepancies. | |
| BI | BI-3-03 | CRIS | % Billing Adjustments – Excluding | The metric definition describes a |
| | | | Charges Adjusted Due to Billing Errors | billing <i>error</i> measurement, not |
| | | | Resulting from Order Activity Post | billing accuracy. |
| | | | Completion Discrepancies. | |

Assessment

To the extent that Verizon does not populate its reports in accordance with the NJ Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines (May 2000), Verizon is not compliant with decisions of the NJ BPU. Additionally, with these reporting discrepancies CLECs cannot verify that they are being provided with the level of service required by the NJ Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines. The inconsistencies and inaccuracies of the metric guidelines and carrier-to-carrier reports could create unreliable metric results for the CLECs.